

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-10, and 14-22 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the amendments and following remarks.

Interview of January 17, 2007

Applicants wish to thank examiner Sumaiya A. Chowdhury and Supervisory Patent Examiner Chris Grant for taking the time to conduct a personal interview with Applicants' representative, Jason Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305), on January 17, 2007 in order to discuss the present application. The substance of the interview was as follows:

Claim Discussed: Claim 1.

Prior Art Discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,505,347 to Kaneko et al. (hereafter "Kaneko").

Proposed Amendment: The above amendment of claim 1 is consistent with the proposed amendment discussed during the interview.

General Results: During the interview, agreement was reached that claim 1 was allowable over Kaneko, and that the Examiner would withdraw the current § 102 rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8-10, and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaneko. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, it was agreed during the interview that claim 1 distinguishes over Kaneko. For example, claim 1 recites decreasing the amount of data in a table based on the following two criteria: (1) achieving a bit rate equal to or lower than a predetermined bit rate, and (2) achieving a sending-out frequency for at least one type of table that is greater than or

equal to a specific frequency. This is supported in the specification at, e.g., page 14, line 16 – page 15, line 7. Conversely, Kaneko merely adjusts the cycle of output of table information based on one criterion, i.e., achieving a predetermined bit rate (see col. 12, lines 42-47).

In view of the foregoing, Kaneko fails to disclose each and every claimed feature of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable, and claims 8-10 and 14-21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,662 to Ong (hereafter “Ong”). Applicants respectfully submit that Ong fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kaneko set forth above in connection with independent claim 1. The Examiner merely relies on Ong to teach deleting information of relative low importance (see Office Action at page 10). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.


Application No. 09/857,491
Amendment dated March 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2006

Docket No.: 1163-0340P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

For By  #47,305
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant